

New Republic



That odor around here isn't coming from West Point

The Charles C. Sherrill Library
EAST TENNESSEE STATE COLLEGE
Johnson City, Tennessee

Letters

The People's Will

● In your June 4 issue, V. O. Key Jr. reviewed *Tyrant from Illinois*. He intimated that a Fair Deal dictator should occupy the Speaker's chair, and that today, as before 1910, the principal powers of the House should rest with the Speaker. He seems to resent Dixiecrat and Republican influence on House affairs, despite the rather obvious fact that a majority of the American people are either Dixiecrat or Republican. (At least that was the situation in 1948; and I doubt if it has improved since then.)

Naturally, the seniority system should be abolished. Naturally, a Fair Deal dictator in the House would be a tremendous boon to the nation. But that is not the people's will. Nor is the will of any democratically minded person to favor the rights of either the majority or the minority completely without consideration for opposition views. No, despite the mess on Capitol Hill, I cannot abandon democracy or representative government or the constitutional system of checks and balances, as Mr. Key seems minded to do.

The comments by Percy Winner in the June 18 issue on the building of a strong Third Force in Italy brought to my mind the hope for such a force in America. In the 1948 elections, 1,340,000 voted as leftists. The Republicans and other rightists claimed 23,240,000. The Democrats numbered 24,110,000. Undoubtedly if the party-line loyalty did not exist, the Republicans and Democrats would have exchanged many voters. What this country needs, as Italy and France need it, is a strong, liberal, unified, determined Third Force, containing liberal Republicans and without the Dixiecrat stigma. The Democratic leaders, good leaders of a prospective Third Force, are hampered by elements in their party which are frankly anti-liberal. Perhaps only by changing the party name will true Democrats lose the conservative South and gain a liberal West and Midwest.

I consider the NR a true voice of the Third Force.

Austin, Texas

GEORGE F. JONES

● Mr. Jones's observations seem to rest on an incomplete reading of my comments. I suggested that the power of a Speaker must rest on his success in compromising differences within his own party, a rather severe limitation on dictatorship. I ventured the guess that no matter what formal authority a Speaker had today he could not compose all the

differences within the Democratic majority but that "an adroit pre-1910-model Speaker could mightily aid the majority in fulfilling its responsibility to the country, in scheduling the business of the House, in forcing decisions and in keeping within tolerable limits the concessions that must be made to the minority of the majority." I am unable to find in such comments a proposal, such as Mr. Jones suggests, to "abandon democracy or representative government or the constitutional system of checks and balances."

Cambridge, Mass.

V. O. KEY JR.

Whom Do They Represent?

● May I add a footnote to F. S. Randall's letter (NR, July 30), wherein he cites Senator Knowland's non sequitur. In this business of Congressional replies lies the answer to those who lament that the consumer, by not writing to his representative, has allowed pressure groups to run the Congress. What is the point in writing when one receives either no reply or a vague oleaginous diffusion?

A rank amateur at writing to my Congressmen, I took pen in hand twice recently. Once I wrote the junior Senator from my state urging him to support constitutional civilian government in the MacArthur case. Still no reply. Last month I wrote my senior Senator urging that he do his part toward expediting the necessary business of the Congress. The reply received had little to do with my letter. Like Senator Knowland's reply, it was irrelevant and immaterial.

My only recourse, evidently, is to vote against these men. Certainly they have demonstrated, perhaps unwittingly, a contempt for me which adds little lustre to their public professions of love of representative government. I am not quite sure whom representatives represent, but I have a rather frightening feeling that they don't care. JOHN A. HARRISON
Gainesville, Fla.

In Defense of Catholicism

● Thus far I've read only M. R. Werner's review of Paul Blanshard's new book, not the book itself. Werner states that "with submissive cowardice most American newspapers and magazines refuse even to report the offenses of Catholicism."

What Mr. Werner fails to consider is that American newspapers and magazines also do not report the offenses of Protestantism, Judaism or, for that matter, Macy's Department Store and the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company.

As for Cardinal Spellman's "intemperate" attack upon Mrs. Roosevelt, upon which "the American press felt free to

comment," Westbrook Pegler attacks Mrs. Roosevelt almost daily in language the Cardinal wouldn't use and the American press doesn't even notice.

Blanshard may offer the reader "careful analysis of . . . their devices for deification of . . . the Pope," but he can't persuade us Catholics that the Pope is a Deity or considers himself one. The Pope is the visible head of the Church, infallible only in matters of faith and morals; he is human, not divine.

Werner says that "in some countries where . . . Catholic authoritarianism has softened up the populations to unquestioning obedience, the Communists have conquered all the more easily."

Yet it took no longer to conquer Protestant Estonia and Latvia than it did Catholic Lithuania. Catholic Warsaw fought the Nazi apostles of totalitarianism until completely destroyed, while Protestant Prague surrendered without a shot.

Finally, in the quote from Blanshard's book, mention is made of the Vatican and the Kremlin and "the nations which they completely conquer."

If Mr. Blanshard will send me the name and address of a nation completely conquered by the Vatican I'd like to move there. I'd like to get a job as Gauleiter and keep the people from learning how to read and write.

(MRS.) DOROTHY PERSICO

La Canada, Calif.

How Britain Lives Now

● In Britain, apparently, from the letter by Mrs. Reynolds (NR, June 18) we live in austerity that Americans do not quite realize, and by inference we don't eat well and don't feel well; our food does not contain the values essential to health and has no appetizing quality.

Yet there is no child in the land who does not know the taste of butter and fresh milk. We may not get all the butter we want but the four-ounce ration for each person at what we now consider a shocking high price of seven pence half penny is there for everybody. Every child gets his or her ration of fresh milk in the school, in addition to the unlimited quantity that can be obtained in the home.

Children in Britain may have ideas of "juicy roast beef" as hazy as those of children in the USA but everyone may have an equal share of what meat there is, whatever the ration. Even with the increased prices of the past few months there is no question of anyone, not even the lowest-income group, being unable because of price to buy their share of essential foods.

(Continued on page 4)

CONTENTS FOR AUG. 20, 1950

- 5 Expel McCarthy
An Editorial
- 6 Russia's "Peace Offensive"
An Editorial
- 7 The Week:
- 7 Acheson's Aid Bill
- 7 General Intelligence
- 8 How Much Defense?
- 8 August Primaries
- 9 Outside America
- 10 The Economic Revival of New
England, by Solomon Barkin
- 12 India: The Danger of War, by
Krishnalal Shridharani
- 13 News of the "Miracle Hor-
mones," by Bruce Bliven
- 15 Millionaires' Tax Amendment,
by Jean Begeman
- 17 Harold L. Ickes
- 18 Books:
- 18 The Story of a Novel, by
Malcolm Cowley
- 10 "The Sea Around Us,"
reviewed by John S. Colman
- 20 "Thomas Mann," reviewed by
Kenneth Rexroth
- 21 Fiction Parade
- 21 Theatre
- 22 On the Air

EDITOR: Michael Straight
EDITORIAL DIRECTOR: Bruce Bliven
PUBLISHER: Daniel Mebane
ASSOCIATE EDITOR: Helen Fuller
ASSISTANT EDITOR: Elizabeth Huling
REPORTERS: Jean Begeman, Arnold J.
Heidenheimer
CONTRIBUTING EDITORS: Malcolm Cowley,
John Farrelly, Harold L. Ickes, Joseph P.
Lash, Max Lerner, James R. Newman,
Gus Tyler
DEPARTMENTS: Robert Hatch (Chief), Cecil
Smith (Music), Saul Carson (Radio and
Television), Harold Clurman (Theatre),
Lincoln Kirstein (Fine Arts)
COPY ASSISTANTS: Marjorie Stanley,
Lucille Davis

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1951, IN
THE U. S. A. BY WESTBURY PUBLICATIONS,
INC., PUBLISHING OFFICE 301 N. ST., N. E.,
WASHINGTON 2, D. C. EDITORIAL AND BUSI-
NESS COMMUNICATIONS SHOULD BE AD-
DRESSED TO 40 EAST 49 ST., NEW YORK 17,
N. Y. ENTERED AS SECOND-CLASS MATTER
SEPTEMBER 26, 1950, AT THE POST OFFICE AT
WASHINGTON, D. C., UNDER THE ACT OF
MARCH 3, 1879. SINGLE COPY, 20c; YEARLY
SUBSCRIPTION, \$6.50; CANADA AND FOREIGN,
\$7.50. PRINTED IN THE U. S. A.

WASHINGTON WIRE

IF THE LONG, wearying session doesn't kill their enthusiasm, a group of Truman-haters in the Senate may outdo all rivals in the investigative art. The fact is that Congress' role as inquisitor has now got out of control of its most responsible leaders. Indifference to Harry Truman's fate is partly to blame. But the way in which committee assignments are made is a more important factor. All committees can and do "investigate," but the nominal investigating group in the upper chamber is the six-man subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in Government, and the Senate's leaders have generally given this as a bottom-drawer assignment to the juniors with an axe to grind. The present six are Republicans McCarthy, Mundt and Nixon, Democrats Hoyer, McClellan and Humphrey. Humphrey is the only Administration supporter—and the only man of courage—in the list. McCarthy is senior GOP member and, with Mundt's and Nixon's help, can swing Dixiecrat McClellan every time; Hoyer, some of the time. So the junior Senator from Wisconsin actually dominates the group in putting an alien and vicious twist upon a legitimate Congressional function.



The subcommittee is now out after the Internal Revenue Bureau files, not to investigate the bureau but to fish for leads that will either hurt the Administration or serve the individual interests of committee members. McCarthy also wants to bracket a new set of foes (columnists and reporters who write about McCarthyism) with his old target, the State Department, in "exposing" the fact that the State Department has used newsmen on "Voice of America" broadcasts and one-shot consultant jobs. Acheson and the American press, the investigation is designed to show, are really in a monstrous plot engineered by propaganda of the British Labour Government. McCarthy has promised the

group the services of his own investigators who already have plenty of "leads." One job the committee has already begun—investigation of Democratic Chairman William Boyle—is not to McCarthy's liking. He doesn't mind going after Boyle (read Truman), but the whole story is spoiled for him because it started with the St. Louis *Post-Dispatch*. It was the *P-D* which led all other newspapers in portraying McCarthy as the back-alley man for the Taft wing of the Republican Party.

If Truman makes another race against Congress, and it looks more and more probable, he will pick and choose when he gets down to talking about the Southern Senators and their coalition with the Taft Republicans. In fact, Mr. Truman's attitude toward keeping the party's record straight down South is a fresh indication of his 1952 intentions.

The President read with interest and utter disbelief a spate of recent columns on the North-South split among the Democrats. These followed Sen. Harry Byrd's June 25 speech at Atlanta, in which Byrd gladly helped Gov. Herman Talmadge pretend that Georgia had some place to go besides Democratic. Truman sincerely believes that Byrd represents only a Dixie version of Republicanism which would turn back the clock and put the South where it was before the coming of the TVA, rural electrification, social security, farm-price supports and free school lunches. Even their own voting records suggest that not more than a third of Byrd's Southern colleagues in the Senate share this rule-or-ruin attitude. The President is courting the other two-thirds, except for one or two who have stepped on the Truman toes (Fulbright, Kefauver). None of those courted will disavow any Southern movement to bar Truman's renomination. But they will go on voting for the chief economic programs of the Fair Deal and will ride out any new Dixie-

crat storm down South if the President runs. Their guess is that Truman would not lose more than three Southern states, even to Eisenhower.

Notes: Ultimate breakdown of the Korean truce talks would defy the almost unanimous views of officials here as stated ever since Malik's broadcast. Previous howling about US Intelligence will seem faint protests indeed if the talks fail. . . . Democratic National Chairman William Boyle, Special Counsel to the President Charles Murphy and at least one liberal Democratic Senator have joined Attorney General J. Howard McGrath in urging Truman to back down on one or both of his nominees for Illinois judgeships whom Sen. Paul Douglas is opposing. McGrath sent one of the Truman appointees to talk to Douglas, but the real efforts are being exerted on the White House, since Douglas has all the chips on his side of the table. We have not found one Truman lieutenant who does not wish that the Boss had let this particular trouble die in limbo. . . . Brig. Gen. Charles A. Willoughby, né von Scheppe-Weidenbach, was McCarran's kind of witness at the latest open session of the subversive activities probe. McCarran, Republican Homer Ferguson, Willoughby and the committee staff had prepared the day before everything for the public right down to a script, and Willoughby even read from it such remarks as, "I'm glad you asked me that question." Willoughby, who was MacArthur's intelligence officer until the end came in Tokyo, didn't know anything about Communism in the government (the committee's major subject) and not much more about the Institute of Pacific Relations (its minor). But with an "Amazing!" from Willoughby and a couple of names and dates from McCarran and Ferguson, the committee turned its blunderbuss north of the border and shot the Far Eastern chief of the Canadian Foreign Ministry as a Communist. His name has to be omitted here (though it wasn't from the hearing) because none of those at the press table could find anything in his notes to prove that the identification was ever made.

Washington, D. C.

T.R.B.

CORRESPONDENCE

(Continued from page 2)

To talk of "British austerity" in the question of food is just so much nonsense. In many foods we are consuming more than we did prewar, particularly dairy produce, milk, butter and cheese. Only in meat and sugar are we consuming appreciably less than we did in the 1930s: about two-thirds the quantity of meat and four-fifths the quantity of sugar.

We should all like more of these foods that "make the mouth water" but we prefer it this way to going back to the time when the wealthiest third of the population drank three times as much milk; ate three times as many eggs; eight times as much fruit; four times as much butter and twice as much meat, as the poorest third of the population. That was a time when the poorest third did not have the minimum food required for health, and one-third of our children suffered from malnutrition. Today we are a far healthier nation and our children age for age are inches taller and pounds heavier than the children of 10 or 15 years ago. I would hazard a guess that in spite of the fact that we may all grumble, and the wealthiest third of the land may consider it unjust in not being allowed to act in an unmannerly way in taking more than their share when the nation sits down to dinner, there are more appetizing meals cooked and eaten now than there were before the war.

H. HILDITCH

Birmingham, England

The Way We Live Now

● When the Reynolds letter on the high cost of living was printed, I was amazed that no one in the office saw the incongruity of her claims, and now this Eckels letter (NR, July 16) does it again.

These women are not giving a complete picture of their financial situation. I have always been poor, and believe me, I know *all* the short cuts to living on an inadequate income. What are these women spending their money on? A car? A house? There must be some reason for their outcry. . . .

There are five of us—adults. We eat WELL—only the top quality of food available in this town of high prices. Our groceries are \$37 to \$43 a week, exclusive of milk.

We use 150-watt bulbs in indirect floor lamps. There are seven of them in the house—not all burning at once, of course. Our bill varies from \$5 in summer to \$7.50 in winter. The gas costs about \$2.20 a month. I do lots of baking. The oil bill for hot water, year round, and winter

heat, is about \$130—never more. Telephone (unlimited service), \$5.75. Water is around \$20 a year—including sprinkling the lawn and garden and car-washing.

Since we own our home (we and the bank), we pay less "rent" than these women do, but I STILL want to see some budgets of your correspondents and know what they are talking about.

Baltimore, Md.

KAY VINING

The Better Side

● In your series of letters "How Americans Live Now," why don't you encourage your readers to send correspondence emphasizing the advantages of democracy over totalitarianism? Or is it the function of a magazine like yours only to show the seamy side of American life?

Brooklyn, N. Y.

JULIAN EINSTEIN

Not in New York

● Mocking laughter from me on reading in T.R.B.: "First anniversary of repeal of the anti-margarine-coloring law . . . saves housewives two billion minutes."

But of course you know that in New York we still have to slap and knead, or is New York too insignificant to consider? I still seethe with rage each time I perform this little tribute to the New York dairy "trust." ADA MURRAY CLARKE

Flushing, N. Y.

Making Friends with Franco

● Congratulations on your editorial, "Making Friends with Franco" (NR, July 30).

As a trained, objective researcher, I spent one year in all parts of the Iberian Peninsula, with confidential access to various angles of Spain's problems, at a rather high level.

Yes, as you say, Franco is more than likely to turn the guns we give him against the Spanish people.

Washington, D. C.

W.B.I.

Douglas for President

● The people expect and deserve the best. In the year 1952 they deserve and if given the chance will elect as President Associate Justice William O. Douglas of the Supreme Court, a genuine, true man of the people.

Muskogee, Okla.

RAYMOND RECTOR

Black for President

● I second the motion of Mr. Horace Casselberry, namely, that the Hon. (and I mean HONORABLE) Mr. Justice Hugo Black be nominated for President of the U.S.

Hollywood, Calif.

ANTONIA HILDER



EXPEL MCCARTHY

THE CONGRESS of the United States, it is said, "largely sets the tone of American political morality." The toleration of one member and his vicious tactics by the upper House is lowering the tone of our political morality dangerously at a time when it is vitally important for the US to be ethically strong before the world.

The contaminating effect which Sen. Joseph R. McCarthy (R, Wis.) is having on our whole political life has been conclusively documented in the report of the Senate investigation into the 1950 Maryland election.

The Senate Elections Subcommittee found that McCarthy played a "leading and potent" part in the smear campaign against Millard Tydings last year. His conduct, the committee says, was "despicable." Sen. William Benton, freshman Democrat from Connecticut, acting with logical directness immediately proposed McCarthy's expulsion from the Senate for the part he played in that election and "his other acts since his election to the Senate." His resolution lies sidetracked in the Rules Committee because of the "press of other business." The Senate, as a whole, indicated shock and fright at Benton's forthright action. Benton's proposal, however, is in strict keeping with the rules and precedents of the Senate.

Article I of the Constitution of the United States provides that "Each House shall be the judge of the elections, returns and qualifications of its own members." The Constitution does not prescribe the qualifications of a Senator except to say that no person shall serve in that body "who shall not have attained to the age of 30 years, and been nine years a citizen of the United States and who shall not, when elected, be an inhabitant of that state for which he shall be chosen." In all the years since the organization of the first Senate, no rules have been established for judging qualifications more specifically; in this, as in the majority of matters, the precedents govern the Senate.

When the members of the Senate Rules Committee come to examine the validity of Senator Benton's resolution to expel McCarthy, it will discover ample precedent to substantiate a decision either for or against. In the first test of its right to insist upon positive qualifications for its members in addition to the negative grounds for exclusion stated in the Constitution, the Senate in 1844 voted to seat Senator-elect John M. Niles even though he

was found to be "laboring under mental debility." But in a series of Civil War cases Senators "failing in loyalty" were not seated, and a generation later Reed Smoot of Utah was judged by a special committee to be "unfit" for the seat he had already held for four years, although he had done no act of which a court could take cognizance.

In 1926, crusading Sen. Tom Walsh (D, Mont.) led a searching debate over the question of expelling Republican Senator-elect Arthur Gould who was charged with bribery, contending that the Constitution made each House the absolute "judge of the qualifications" of its members and should be held to cover the question of general fitness on moral grounds. The brief prepared for that argument provides the thesis for challenging McCarthy today:

The Constitution expressly confers the power [to judge qualifications] without limitations upon the Senate; the practice of the colonies upholds the power; the best governmental policy demands that the Senate exercise the power.

There is no lack of precedent for an action to remove McCarthy from the Senate. There is urgent reason to do so.

Perhaps the most important is that stated by Senator Benton: "In my opinion, Senator McCarthy has lowered the respect of decent people for representative government by his attacks upon the character of respectable citizens from the sanctuary of the Senate floor." The abuse of Congressional immunity which exonerates members on the floor from regular laws of libel and slander, Benton goes on, "has been monstrous in recent years."

One national columnist has characterized McCarthy's ruthless intimidation of his press critics as "the greatest challenge to freedom of the press since the civil war."

Surely his qualifications are questionable on personal ethics alone. The fact that violations of the income-tax laws and other irregularities of which McCarthy is accused are not directly connected with the circumstances of his election does not exclude these matters as subjects of proper inquiry by the Senate if precedent is followed.

McCarthy's vilification without foundation of government officials, including Gen. George C. Marshall and our key foreign policymakers, has weakened the position of the US abroad in time of war. His line of attack

against our government could not have been more effectively devised to aid the Soviets had the Russians themselves dictated the moves.

McCarthy's contempt for the principles of truth and justice upon which constitutional democracy has been nourished in the past is destroying the greatest appeal the US has to offer in the contest for world leadership.

Left free to exploit the fear and frustration he has propagated, McCarthy, and the Taft-Wherry gang around him will make a shambles of the 1952 elections. Conceivably, by embracing McCarthyism, the Republican Party could "ride to political victory on the Four Horsemen of Calumny—fear, ignorance, bigotry and smear," as Sen. Margaret Chase Smith and the six other Republicans who joined in her "Declaration of Conscience" last year foresaw. As they also observed, however, "Surely it would ultimately be suicide for the Republican Party

and the two-party system that has protected our American liberties from the dictatorship of a one-party system." Republicans who are tempted to vote against expulsion of McCarthy now and hope for a McCarthy-led victory in 1952 might consider what place they would occupy in a McCarthy-bossed GOP a few years later. In the absence of clear legal precedent it would seem that the Senate is free to resort to ethical standards in considering the Benton resolution to expel McCarthy.

The Senate can set up any standard of qualifications for membership it chooses, at any time. It is free to exercise its moral judgment on whether to condone or condemn the villainy of a McCarthy before the world today. The seven Democratic and the six Republican members of the Senate Rules Committee who have the power to approve or disapprove the Benton resolution for floor action carry a heavy responsibility.

RUSSIA'S "PEACE OFFENSIVE"

THERE is no doubt that Russia is in the midst of a great "peace offensive." She has now broadcast and published the McMahon Resolution expressing friendship for the Russian people, and President Truman's letter of transmissal. She has printed in *Pravda* an article along the same general lines by Herbert Morrison, British Foreign Secretary. N. M. Shvernik, president of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet, has written to President Truman asking a five-power peace conference. A new English-language fortnightly in Moscow, *News*, is pounding away at the same theme. All over the world, Russian diplomats have suddenly begun to turn up amiably at social gatherings of Western officials, which they had been boycotting. The heat is on.

The most important matter in the world, just now, is the effort to prevent a third world war. No chance to forward the hope of peace, however slim, should be disregarded. In this cause we should gladly upset precedents, lose face if necessary, take chances. Bearing all this in mind, we are forced to the reluctant conclusion that the Russian peace maneuver is not genuine, and represents no real change in policy.

Russia proposes to reduce armament without settling any of the great, worldwide issues in dispute between herself and the West. You can't have disarmament without removing the dangers because of which the nations arm. The world cannot afford to go through the farce of another Kellogg-Briand Pact "outlawing" war.

Russia proposes to abolish atomic weapons, but refuses to accept the United Nations plan which would have

done away with these weapons, with guarantees that they could not be bootlegged.

Russia deliberately makes an unacceptable proposal when she demands a conference of five powers, one of which would be Communist China, which has been solemnly held to be guilty of aggression in Korea.

Russia talks peace, but her acts still mean trouble. The youth rally in East Berlin a few days ago was dedicated to hatred of the West. Yugoslavia continues to be threatened. Russia does everything she can to prevent peace treaties with Japan and Germany. She fights hard against the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. She must bear a great part of the responsibility for the lagging truce talks in Korea.

Spokesmen for the UN are quite correct in pointing out that that organization provides complete machinery for such peace talks as the Russians now propose. The record proves that they appeal to the UN when it suits their purposes, and try to by-pass it when they feel they have more to gain by doing so.

While Russia's attitude offers no real hope of peace, her overtures should not therefore be rejected out of hand. It is all to the good that the McMahon Resolution, the Truman letter and the Morrison article have been brought to the Russian people. Every additional chance should be taken to drive wedges into all possible cracks in the Iron Curtain. In an understanding of the purposes of the democracies by the mass of the Russian people lies the best hope for lasting peace.

THE WEEK

ACHESON'S AID BILL

Secretary of State Dean Acheson, still directing the nation's foreign policies after an abortive Republican effort to cut off his pay, has stubbornly persisted in performing the duties of his office. While he has lost political friends so heavily that he has almost none left to lose, Acheson's policies continue to be adopted in substance by his enemies in Congress and elsewhere. The foreign-aid program, proposing an unprecedented \$8.5 billion annual expenditure, is a good case in point. The program makes some compromises to the politics of pressure and strategy, and Congress is in the process of whittling away at some vital components, but it is apparent that we will not renege on the American commitment of military and economic assistance to our allies.

With repetitious logic, Acheson built up so air-tight a case for an ambitious aid program which carries the Marshall Plan concept into the rearmament era that even the most heedless of his opponents have been forced to go along. When first introduced, the huge fund request was greeted by truculent cat-calls. But the size and nature of the cuts voted in committee so far indicate the marginal strength of the opposition. The House Foreign Affairs Committee, attempting to make some economies, has voted to cut \$650 million, or seven percent, from the total of aid requested for Europe—\$265 million in military, and \$285 million in economic aid. The Senate committee is not likely to be any more severe although the Senate itself may cut slightly deeper.

Acheson's success in selling this program to his enemies has not come gratis. Both Franco and Chiang Kai-shek have been drawn closer to our national bosom, in violation of earlier declarations of principle. The State Department's more imaginative policies—typified by Point Four—have been watered down. Asian programs have suffered in favor of

European defense. Europe is slated to get three-quarters of the fund for next year. Devastated Korea was scheduled to receive a modest \$112 million relief allocation from the US via the United Nations until House committee chairman James P. Richards (D, S.C.) cut it to \$12 million because "rehabilitation cannot begin until the war is over."

But the passage of the foreign-aid program will mean general acceptance of the fact that American leadership cannot be achieved or retained cheaply and make it probable that the over-all structure built by Acheson will continue to stand after his term has passed.

GENERAL INTELLIGENCE

Haughty, self-possessed Maj. Gen. Charles A. Willoughby faced the Senators at the committee table. The chief of MacArthur's intelligence in the Philippines and Japan, a "student of history," had been called before Sen. Pat McCarran's Subcommittee on Internal Security to lend his knowledge in an effort to discredit the Institute of Pacific Relations and to testify, as Sen. Homer Ferguson (R, Mich.) put it, on the "effect of Communism on American foreign policy in the Far East." About to retire from his Army post, the General felt free to speak. But his concern was evidently with broad issues of geopolitical significance, and he found it difficult to confine himself to the narrow questions closest to the committee's heart, those of Communist domination of the IPR, and, indirectly, of the State Department.

The drama of Willoughby's appearance was somewhat lessened by the fact that the Senate committee's competitor, the House Committee on Un-American Activities, was on the same day hearing a Japanese intelligence expert tell about the same case which Willoughby used as the base for his remarks—the fantastic story of Richard Sorge. Sorge, a German Communist, until July, 1941, tripled in brass as press attaché of the

Nazi Embassy in Tokyo, intimate of top men in the Japanese Foreign Office and Colonel in the Red Army's Intelligence branch. In pre-Pearl Harbor days, Sorge was said to have worked with a "ring" which included two former secretaries of the Japanese sections of the IPR, and two Occidental students of Far Eastern problems, Agnes Smedley and Gunther Stein, who had written for IPR publications, but had never been associated with the organization.

The McCarran committee's interest lay in establishing not that the Japanese section of the IPR was Communist controlled, a fact somewhat remote in time and space even for it, but that the Kremlin's influence over-shadowed the American Council of the IPR, an autonomous group whose trustees include Gen. George Marshall and a generous quota of Wall Street lawyers.

Willoughby provided the committee only marginal support. He said he thought that the case of Hozumi Ozaki, the Japanese Communist executed with Sorge, should be "extremely interesting to this committee studying the quality of members of the IPR. Ozaki was a good type member of the IPR." At another point he testified that Kinkazu Saionji, the other Japanese aid of Sorge and a private secretary to Prince Konoye, "belonged to the bright young men who met in the so-called breakfast club." Committee Counsel George Morris said, "So they had them in Japan, too."

It was evident that the intelligence expert in the General was having something of a battle with what he termed his "citizen's duty" to help the committee. Talking about Sorge's incredible spy apparatus, he could not help but admire "the quality of the man's work." He thought it attributable "less to inherent talent than to the advantages of the situation," but still he described Sorge as "superbly competent." His eulogies caught the Senators' imaginations. Ferguson remarked wishfully: "If only we had had Americans like Agnes Smedley give us information like that."

The General regretted that his absence in the Far East had not permitted him to keep up with domestic political developments. He had been catching up lately and highly recommended two articles, one in the *American Legion Magazine* and the other by Ralph Tolledano in the *American Mercury*, which he found extremely revealing of the way in which leftist book reviewers and editors managed to get attention for books which followed the Party line. Books which showed the necessity of defending the "outposts of Western civilization from Alaska to Indonesia" were deprecated, the General had learned in those articles. He had been "painfully disillusioned" on his return to find many Americans taken in by the propaganda of the people described by Mr. Tolledano. "You mean Communists?" asked a Senator. "Oh, Communists, fellow-travelers, so-called liberals, that whole group we've been reading in the press about," replied the General.

HOW MUCH DEFENSE?

The House passed the Department of Defense appropriations bill, carrying \$56 billion for the present fiscal year on August 9, by a vote of 348 to 2. This does not, however, account for the total appropriations and authorizations. There are \$37 billion of unexpended authorizations remaining to the Defense Department from previous fiscal years. The Military Public Works bill of \$5.7 billion is still to be considered. The major portion of the \$8.5 billion requested for foreign military and economic assistance is chargeable to defense. The cost of the Korean War, furthermore, has not been budgeted. The totals available for defense expenditure, exclusive of additional costs in Korea, exceed \$107 billion. Between \$50 billion and \$60 billion of this are expected to be expended in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952.

These appropriations are intended to carry out the first fully developed military policy in our history. This is to maintain an active force to fulfill our overseas commitments which can operate immediately upon the outbreak of war, to-

gether with sufficient additional forces and reserves to provide a base for rapid expansion. Industrially it is designed to assure sufficient armaments and supplies on hand to fight the first year of a war and to equip the forces to be mobilized. Beyond this period industrial capacity is to be developed to take care of all requirements after the first year.

This well-conceived, long-range plan is in danger of being lost because of the demands of the separate services for increased strengths. Rep. Carl Vinson, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, is supporting an increase in strength of the Marine Corps of between 100,000 and 200,000; he is backing an increase in the Air Force to 163 wings, roughly 70 percent more than the presently planned 95 wings; he proposes to build two new 60,000 ton aircraft carriers; and he has intimated that he believes the Army should be increased by 300,000 men.

The cost of these increases has not been estimated, but personnel increases alone would amount to approximately one million men, raising the armed forces to between 3.5 million and 4.5 million men. This would amount to three percent of our population under arms compared to less than two and one-half percent for the Soviet Union.

It is difficult to see how this much manpower can be supplied under existing laws. Selective Service can draw on about 750,000 men annually, or for the two-year period of service, 1.5 million men. Career personnel of between 1 million and 1.5 million men can be maintained. This makes a total of between 2.5 million and 3 million men that can be counted on for the long pull. The difference between this number and the present strength of the armed forces is accounted for by 800,000 National Guardsmen and reservists, and by the pool of men too young to have served in the last war.

To maintain the forces advocated by Representative Vinson would require not only the use of all our National Guard and reserve forces, but also an increase in the length of service to three years. Neither of these alternatives is likely to be adopted.

Each of the services can justify the

increases proposed, but each is thinking of its own problems. What they ask cannot be provided. The dollars could be furnished, but the men cannot be, short of war.

AUGUST PRIMARIES

In three Southern primary elections held this August, no decisive upsets have been recorded; only in one, Kentucky, are liberals in control of the Democratic Party. In Virginia and Mississippi, conservatives, at odds with the Truman Administration, appear in the saddle.

Senator Byrd's Democratic machine still reigns supreme in Virginia.

Hard-pressed at many points throughout the state, economy-minded Byrd and his 100,000 state payrollers benefited from an unusually light vote and maintained their domination of the Virginia Democratic Party, suffering only two key setbacks.

Control of the Virginia State Legislature was not at stake. Only 14 of 40 Senate seats were contested in the primary, and only 37 of the 100 seats in the House of Delegates.

Highlight of the Virginia campaign was a spirited effort in Princess Anne County by a "People's Ticket" to unseat the Byrd men in both state and local contests. By narrow margins, the Administration won in each instance although the voting was close.

In Mississippi, rigid States' Righter and former Governor, Hugh White, finished on top of an eight-candidate race for the Democratic nomination for governor. His opponent in the second Democratic primary on August 28 will be young Paul Johnson Jr., who, while disagreeing with the Administration on many issues, possibly would work with Washington.

Gov. Fielding Wright, vice-presidential nominee on the States' Rights ticket in 1948, was barred by statute from seeking a succeeding term.

Kentucky's liberal and popular Democratic Governor, Lawrence Wetherby, swamped his three opponents by the largest plurality in history and carried his state ticket with him. His Republican opponent in November will be Eugene Siler.

Outside America

FRANCO'S EVIL EYE

The simple people of the back alleys of Naples paid a king's farewell to the late Adm. Forrest P. Sherman. Not since the days when the Bourbons ruled had there been such a solemn procession through the streets, with such elaborateness of mortuary pomp, and with so large a crowd of obviously sad onlookers.

Moreover, the descendants of the *lazzaroni*, as deeply superstitious as they are ardently royalist, also mourned the American Admiral as the innocent victim of a king's curse. For many years, the belief had been widespread among them that Spain's King Alfonso XIII spread bad luck because he had the *jettatura*—the evil eye. And in the death of Admiral Sherman in the prime of his life, indeed just before he was to have replaced General Bradley as the top military figure in America, they saw—in their superstitious way—a sign that the contact with Generalissimo Francisco Franco had brought fatal bad luck. Quite evidently, they said, Franco had acquired the evil eye—with all its maleficent consequences—because he had taken unto himself the heritage of Alfonso XIII.

The importance of the very general Western European criticism of the new American attitude toward Franco—and even more of the apparent willingness of the Americans to accept his brand of monarchism—is that much of it does not come either from the Communists or from the political Left. Equally important is the source of much of the approval.

Here in Italy, the neo-Fascists, the crypto-Fascists and the most reactionary elements among the clericals are delighted. The *Tempo* of Rome, notoriously Fascist in sympathy, hails American "realism." In France, the neutralist *Monde* of Paris is pleased for reasons which are transparently not pro-American. The Right bloc in the new Assembly—the Independents and Peasants—is equally pleased; and Charles de

Gaulle's spokesman, Count Gaston Palewski, berates the French Government for its "absurd obstinacy in not letting Spain become an integral part of a continental and transcontinental strategic ensemble in which [Gaullist] France would be the center."

But Don Juan, pretender to the throne of Spain, takes a very dim view of Franco's so-called "conciliation" of the monarchists. In a statement issued on his behalf in Lisbon, Franco's cabinet changes were called a mockery of Spanish and world opinion.

Never has Franco headed a government as totalitarian, as Nazi, as anti-British; and there is no sign whatsoever of any possibility of a change in his policy.

When American High Commissioner John J. McCloy told a German audience that the United States was not prepared to "buy security at the expense of reactionary developments," the liberal Manchester *Guardian* asked acidly: "Was Mr. McCloy ill-informed of his government's policy, or does Spain fall outside the application of this policy?"

After the drum-fire of American warnings to Europeans to avoid the temptation of appeasement, there is a very poor reception for such statements as that of the New York *Herald Tribune* that "it is folly to court Spain's enmity," and "it would be shortsighted on the part of Britain and France to continue to oppose military arrangements which Spain and the United States might find mutually satisfactory." The European view is that the Americans are shortsighted—to say the least—if they do not notice that "like a cardsharp asked to redeal by inexperienced opponents, Franco has dealt himself another rigged hand."

It is even more shortsighted on the part of the Americans to imagine that in the long run—even on a strictly military basis—the right to use Spanish ports and airfields (when Moroccan, Portuguese and southern French ones are already available) can compensate for the loss of the good will of peoples on whose soil equally important—and probably more important—bases are located, such as Mouaceur, Metz-Frescaty, Antwerp, Cherbourg, Chateauroux,

Bordeaux, La Rochelle, Leghorn, Naples, Port Lyäutey and those in the British Isles.

The *Observer* of London comments:

The new American move weakens the Atlantic treaty. It introduces a factor of intrigue and jealousy into Western Europe and opens a way for Europe's Fascists in every country to compete with Europe's democrats for America's favors. . . . It is not a light matter that there will now exist, for the first time, an American alliance in Europe which competes with the North Atlantic Treaty. From being the expression of a true political community among the Atlantic democracies, and the growing point of a future Atlantic Union, the North Atlantic Treaty is suddenly relegated to the status of one among several possible American military alliances in Europe, and unrepentant totalitarians are encouraged to suppose that they can get the same terms from America as democratic governments can.

This fact will not be lost on Germany's neo-Nazis and Italy's neo-Fascists, and it will not ease the task of the new and struggling German and Italian democracies.

The main difference between Tito and Franco, which makes dealings with the Spanish dictator altogether different (from a practical if not a moral viewpoint) from dealing with the Yugoslav dictator, is that while Tito divides the enemy camp, Franco divides our own. Yet the month of September may be crucial for the soundness and dependability of the Atlantic community. The United States has in effect called upon Britain and France to co-operate in working out a definitive three-power pact on German participation in the defense of Germany. Opposition to this plan, already strong, will be increased by the American-Spanish pact.

Then, after the signing of the Japanese Treaty, there will be meetings of the Atlantic Council and of the Defense Committee. A whole series of questions of vital importance to Atlanticism will come up, both political and military, not only on Germany but also on Greece, Turkey, the whole Mediterranean and the Middle East. If they are taken up in an atmosphere poisoned by the Caudillo's *jettatura*, the result will be tragic proof of the folly of courting Franco Spain's friendship.

Naples

PERCY WINNER

THE ECONOMIC REVIVAL OF NEW ENGLAND

THE New England economy faces problems in many respects similar to those of old England. The major manufacturing industries of the region are contracting. Its business leaders are more concerned with protecting accumulated capital and the status quo in general than in promoting regional progress. Businessmen and local governments in these six states are, on the whole, meeting the challenge of the times with less vigor and imagination than are their opposite numbers in old England. The solutions to the problem of economic stagnation in New England are fairly palpable and require no regime of austerity, but the determination to find them is faltering and the organizations are less available for achieving these goals.

by **Solomon Barkin**

The need for a structural re-adaptation of New England's economic activities to modern trends and "the rebirth of alert" business leadership is boldly spelled out in the report on "The New England Economy" recently released by a group of New England economists recruited from each of the six states of the region. It is the first over-all, detailed study in 15 years candidly to analyze the problems and outline the opportunities in New England. This report was prepared at the request of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, and publication of it was paid for by the Federal Government.

CIO unions in the area and liberals like Chester Bowles have expressed alarm in the postwar years at the failure of the people in the region to face up to the facts about industrial contraction and have pressed for such an investigation.

But it is characteristic that until a federal agency stepped into the picture, it was not possible to obtain agreement on a co-ordinated study by a group within the region. Attempts by the New England governors to set up a New England Development Authority Compact were defeated by the utility interests who feared that an attack on the high power rates in the region would result. More intensive studies of the problems raised by this committee are being made under national guidance by a federal interdepartmental agency on New England-New York resources, and by the Committee on New England organized by the National Planning Association.

The failure of local people to initiate a movement for the revitalization of New England's economy is symptomatic of the absence of "enterprising manage-

ment." The committee report stresses that family enterprises have favored dynastic control, with a resulting decline in the quality of management and the disappearance of the kind of enterprising spirit which activated the early Yankee businessmen and traders.

The committee deplores the "lethargy and complacency [which prevail] among New England industrialists." They have not, with few marked exceptions, taken up new ideas, processes, products and techniques. Plant and equipment have been permitted to drift into obsolescence. New supervisory and managerial talent here have not been recruited. New England industry has made less use of research than other regions. Owners have drained their companies of their capital. Speculators have been allowed to buy older companies to wring them dry, use them to advantage in tax calculations and sell them as real estate. Relations between employers and unions have been devoid of originality or willingness to depart from habit-worn patterns.

Instead of tackling technological and social problems with the "ingenuity, inventiveness and shrewdness" which produced the "flowering of New England," its industrialists have taken a defeatist position, insisting that the handicaps facing them are insuperable. Enterprise has been discouraged by the persistent talk of differentials on labor, materials, transportation, fuel, taxes, etc. New England Congressmen rose almost as one man against an industry decentralization amendment to the Defense Production Act. Although New England's electric-power rates, both to retail consumers and industrial users, run from a third to a half more than the national average, Senator Aiken of Vermont has been obliged to carry on single-handed the fight for public-power development and the advancement of the St. Lawrence Seaway and Power Project. Proponents of this project propose that New England be assigned a substantial bloc of the 2.2 million horsepower capacity that will be generated near Massena, N. Y. Power "brown outs" have handicapped industries in New England in recent years.

Only a very few declining New England communities have undertaken to create diversified types of employment—and in these cases only when virtual bankruptcy, due to total shut-down of textiles or some other similar old-line industry, occurred. State governments have fallen down badly in aiding small business. There are only scattered illustrations of genuine promotional effort by local groups to obtain new enterprises. Nor have the industrial leaders taken advantage of the defense

Solomon Barkin is Director of Research, Textile Workers Union of America, CIO.

program to expand and modernize their plant capacity and to strengthen the newer industries. No plans are in the making for developing employment for the larger number of older persons displaced by the contracting industries. Groups are resisting the extension of natural-gas lines which would reduce fuel costs. The committee concludes that the New England states have not made "the most of their assets" either in economic terms or in respect to the natural resources of the area which could be developed without such large appropriations as projects in the West or the South have required.

Besides suffering from unenterprising management, New England's financial wealth is substantially concentrated in trusts and insurance companies. These institutions put "safety first" in investment policy. They are inclined to close down businesses to preserve their capital rather than risk additional funds to revitalize a concern that has run down but could be put back on its feet. The investors are more often *rentiers* than venturing businessmen. The bolder financial interests have invested outside of New England in new areas where profits seem more assured and have sent their more promising managers to those places. A recent RFC report on the ownership of a Texas oil concern read like the social register of Back Bay Boston. New England has not been offering funds for new businesses in its region in proportion to its needs. The beneficiaries of New England fortunes have shown little regard for the economic future of the region.

A particularly baffling factor in the decline of New England is given only a sort of discreet but hasty glance in the report made for the Economic Council. American vitality rests on initiative and opportunity. New England's dominant economic groups have lost the former and restricted the latter. Through their economic controls the older population repressed the newer "ethnic and religious groups." Although these groups constituted a growing proportion of the population, their vigor, alertness and vitality were not encouraged. Even as of the current date, few men stemming from this stratum of immigration are owners of significant regional manufacturing enterprises. Members of these racial groups have built sound local businesses, but almost entirely devoted to serving their own community. The discrimination exercised by the "Yankee" has deprived New England of the versatile pioneering spirit of these people. Only since the last war have there been an impressive number of cases of people descended from these new groups coming prominently to the fore in the local industrial scene. New England has paid the price for the undemocratic attitudes of its dominant groups.

The committee of economists who prepared and signed this stimulating and helpful report has not proposed any

mechanism by which economic progress can be brought about in New England. Clearly a central agency is needed which will investigate possibilities, promote and push new enterprise, and rekindle a faith in the future of the region in the minds of the men who control the capital reserves and the vested interests, such as railroads, banks and power companies. Interstate compacts as a method of getting things done have failed repeatedly. It is painfully clear that without action by the Federal Government nothing positive or important will get under way. The state governments will not fall into line until the power lobby, the port of Boston group and their friends have been ousted from the driver's seat on all basic issues affecting the region. The committee report spells out some important first steps that must be taken, including the location of a steel mill in the region, which would make possible new metal fabricating plants.

Regional and community institutions of learning and more extensive aid from the US Department of Commerce are suggested as means of improving technical and managerial competence. The committee recommends venture capital corporations to promote new local enterprises. Even here, however, without federal aid and guarantees, nothing substantial is practically feasible.

We can join in the above and other recommendations offered by the committee, including the high national minimum standards of working conditions and a local stockpile of public works to meet recessions. But the guarded statements on power will hardly produce lower rates. Nor do we believe that the need for stimulating economic growth in New England justifies the shifting of the tax burden from the high income groups to those less able to pay. Economic incentives may have to be created in ways such as those provided by the DPA.

New England can grow. Its opportunities are many. The rich reserve of human talent must be tapped by encouraging enterprise, particularly among the newer ethnic groups. The large universities can do more to stimulate more local settlement of its promising graduates. The secondary-school system must be reoriented to provide the training necessary for the growth of the newer industries. Many new industries are being built on the research conducted by the major New England universities; they can be located in New England. The contiguity to Canada's rich resources promises new developments. A more concerted program which commands the confidence and support of, and promises benefits to, all the people can succeed. Perhaps an organization must be founded by the everyday people of New England, headed by the progressive elements including the trade unions, to lead in the industrial and economic growth of the region.

INDIA: THE DANGER OF WAR

NEVER since August 15, 1947, when the Siamese twins, India and

by Krishnalal Shridharani

Pakistan, had a forced and bloody birth, have the two neighbors been closer to war than they are today. The immediate struggle is over Kashmir, but if war comes it will not be confined, as Pakistan Prime Minister Liaquat Ali Khan wishes, to that region. It will be fought, as Nehru has repeatedly made clear, on all possible fronts. India does not propose to limit herself to militarily adverse terrain.

The roots of the Kashmir crisis go back to the days when the British decided to divide the sub-continent and quit. Predominantly Moslem areas contiguous to each other were vivisected away from India and made into Pakistan. This is the basis of Pakistan's claim on Kashmir—that the State is contiguous to Pakistan and that her population is about 77 percent Moslem.

India's claim to Kashmir is not so simple and has received only lukewarm appreciation in the West. The British had decided to quit after dividing only "British India"; the fate of "Princely India," in which the State of Jammu and Kashmir fell, was left in the hands of the various Maharajahs and Nabobs. Each ruling prince was free to decide whether to join his State to India or to Pakistan. On October 26, 1947, the ruler of the State of Jammu and Kashmir made an offer of accession to India. India accepted the offer on the following day, and thus acquired legal title to Kashmir.

India claims that she also acquired moral title to Kashmir. Leaders like Nehru and Patel (Gandhi was opposed) had agreed under duress to what they considered the "inhuman principle of partition." India never subscribed to the "two-nation theory," which, even after the birth of Pakistan, left some 40 million Moslems in Indian territory. The fate of this minority would always be in jeopardy unless India could defeat the two-nation theory and establish a secular state. Kashmir provided the first effective negation of the two-nation theory; when the ruler of Kashmir offered his State to India, he was powerfully backed by the National Conference, a predominantly Moslem, though non-communal, political organization with an overwhelming following in the territory. Here were Moslems themselves, under the leadership of Sheik Abdullah (currently Kashmir's Prime Minister), who were eager

to join what Pakistan described as "Hindu India." Moreover, Kashmir is physically contiguous to India also.

Within two months of the British departure, on October 20, 1947, tribesmen and Pakistan nationals invaded Kashmir from Pakistan territory. The invaders had rolled down to the very gates of Shrinagar when India made a stand in the State's defense in the last week of October, 1947. From then on, tribesmen and Pakistan nationals, not officially recognized by Pakistan, began to fall back. But then the situation became so desperate that on May 8, 1948, Pakistan's regular forces invaded Kashmir. This action was later described by Sir Owen Dixon, the UN representative, as being "inconsistent with international law."

As the battle line seesawed, India decided to appeal to international authority. She had gone to the defense of Kashmir only after declaring that the "freely expressed will" of the people of the State will finally decide whether or not they will remain in India. Then, on January 1, 1948, she complained to the Security Council that Pakistan was a party to invasion of "a part of India."

After exactly one year of wrangling, UN intervention bore fruit on January 1, 1949, when a cease-fire was declared and a line dividing opposing forces was established.

For the past 18 months, efforts have been made under UN auspices to obtain demilitarization of the State preparatory to an impartial plebiscite on whether the people want to remain with India or join Pakistan. But India claims that Pakistan, as an aggressor, must clear out first, and refuses to be put on a par with Pakistan.

This has produced a deadlock which has proved more vexing to Pakistan than to India. The latter holds Kashmir and has great staying power. When the people of Kashmir decided to hold a Constituent Assembly in September without waiting for a UN plebiscite, it proved to be the straw that broke the back of the Pakistan camel. After months of feverish efforts, and with the aid of British and American delegations, Pakistan succeeded in persuading the Security Council to adopt the resolution of March 30, 1951, which appointed Dr. Frank Graham as UN representative and envisaged "arbitration" on points of disagreement.

India rejected the principle of "arbitration" as contrary to the interests of the people concerned and as a violation of her sovereign right in Kashmir. While she accorded all courtesies to Dr. Graham during his visits

Krishnalal Shridharani, one-time staff member of the Department of Sociology at Columbia University, is the author of several books on India and correspondent for many Indian newspapers. He is the New Republic correspondent in New Delhi.

to Delhi, she did not commit herself in any respect.

Although on a mission that seems hopeless in the light of India's rejection of the March, 1951, Resolution, Dr. Graham's presence has probably prevented the outbreak of open hostilities. It seems now or never, so far as Pakistan is concerned. There are blackouts in such Pakistan cities as Lahore and Pindi. Young men are signing pledges of loyalty in their blood, and Liaquat Ali Khan has given "the mailed fist" as a symbol to his nation. The Pakistan press and platform resound with demand for a *Jehad*, or religious war, against India.

As border raids and kidnaping from Pakistan increased, India moved her armies, hoping to stave off war by the maneuver. Nehru had warned that this time the fight will not be confined to Kashmir alone, so Indian troops took positions on the borders of West and East Pakistan also. Thus Dr. Graham is confronted with a larger assignment than the Security Council Resolution equips him for. The question of demilitarizing Kashmir is engulfed by the militarization of the entire border between India and Pakistan. Reports from Pakistan indicate that the powder keg may be ignited when and if the Graham mission fails.

Pakistan is believed to be swayed by such considerations as these:

First, there is a note of desperation; Pakistan seems convinced that if the Graham mission fails, force alone can now win the Vale of Kashmir.

Second, her air force is far more potent than it was two years back; her Jets and Furys are faster than anything India possesses.

Third, she has increased her army, spending about 70 percent of her total revenue on defense in 1951-52, as against India's 43 percent. (There are rumors in India that two British experts, Field Marshal Sir Claude

Auchinleck, who used to be the Commander-in-Chief of undivided India, and Gen. Sir Douglas Gracey, who used to be the Commander-in-Chief of Pakistan, are taking a personal hand in the training and deployment of Pakistan troops. Nehru alleged recently that retired British military officers in Pakistan had "added greatly to the prevailing tension.")

Fourth, Pakistan expects sympathy and aid from the Moslem Near East.

Fifth, and crucially, Pakistan fully expects Anglo-American backing. Yet this idea may be unfounded. The *Statesman*, a British-owned-and-edited daily published from Calcutta and Delhi, often charged in India with pro-Pakistan bias, has editorialized: "The Pakistan Foreign Ministry should disabuse the press of the totally erroneous notion, which a section at least entertains, that in the event of war, help would come from abroad."

Among considerations that might deter Pakistan from the paths of war is the objective fact of India's power and the possibility that "the one bloc" may side with India if "the other bloc" backs Pakistan. Moreover, Pakistan has created a difficult problem for herself on her Northwest frontier by trying to suppress the Pathan autonomy movement in the tribal area supported by Afghanistan. For the past 50 years, Kabul has been eying Baluch port outlets to the Arabian Sea. A similar predicament prevails in East Pakistan, which has rubbed Burma the wrong way by attempting to Moslemise the Arakan border. Thus Pakistan must think of both her flanks, which might be in trouble in case of a major engagement with India.

Such are the forces that work for peace and war. But so far as India is concerned, she feels, rightly or wrongly, that in the main, the Anglo-American attitude will influence Pakistan's decision.

NEWS OF THE "MIRACLE HORMONES"

HALF A DOZEN important pieces of news have come along in the past few weeks about cortisone, one of the two new "miracle hormones" that have turned the medical world upside down in the past 30 months.

Several of these have to do with new sources for cortisone. At present it is manufactured from ox or sheep bile by a process that is extremely complicated and expensive. The total available supplies of raw material are so small that there is at present no possibility of meeting the pressing, worldwide needs for the hormone, either for therapy or for continued research.

Almost simultaneously, news has come that the syn-

by **Bruce Bliven**

thesis has been accomplished from a number of new sources, most of them abundant in nature. A large chemical manufacturing company in Mexico City, Syntex, Inc., has announced that cortisone can be extracted from a variety of wild Mexican yam, by a process involving the comparatively small number of only 15 steps. The company hopes within a year or so to be able to double the amount of cortisone now being produced commercially in the US.

Nearly at the same moment, Merck and Company, a big American drug-manufacturing house, announced that it has succeeded in making cortisone out of four substances: ergosterol, which comes from yeast; stigmasterol,

from soy beans; diosgenin, from the Mexican yam; and cholesterol, a fatty substance found in the bodies of animals and human beings.

A few months ago, there was great interest in the announcement that Prof. Robert B. Woodward and his associates at Harvard University had gone a long way toward a completely synthetic cortisone, from chemical substances. New developments recently revealed at Harvard indicate that great additional progress has been made, both by Professor Woodward's group and one directed by Prof. Louis F. Fieser. As a result, it seems reasonable to hope that before long, it may be possible to produce cortisone in commercial quantities from a common chemical derived from coal tar.

Two American drug-manufacturing houses, the Schering Corporation and Merck and Company, have both announced special forms of cortisone to be used in a wide range of diseases of the eye. As is the case with diseases in other parts of the body, cortisone does not cure afflictions of the eye, but suppresses symptoms, and may thus be able to prevent irreversible damage to the eye while the disease is running its course. The Schering Corporation says that its hormone is produced by a simplified process under which a given amount of bile from oxen or sheep results in about 50 times as much cortisone as could formerly be obtained.

In the two and a half years since the discovery of cortisone and ACTH, there has been ample confirmation of the statement that together they constitute one of the great medical advances of all time. It is still true, as I have said, that by their own action, they cure almost nothing. What they do is to suppress the symptoms of a long range of diseases, of which rheumatoid arthritis is the best known. The real significance of these hormones lies in the additions they are making, almost every day, to our knowledge of the functions of the body. In medicine, as in so many other aspects of human affairs, knowledge is power.

Just how these hormones achieve the result of suspending symptoms of various diseases is not yet known. Cortisone is one of several hormones secreted by the cortex of the adrenal glands. ACTH (the adreno-corticotrophic hormone) is secreted by the pituitary and presumably acts to stimulate the secretion of cortisone by the adrenals. (There are many other instances of endocrine glands which stimulate each other in this way.) It is assumed that in certain diseases there is a deficiency of cortisone, or alternatively that an ample supply of it has some special effect that is not yet quite clear; but these ideas are still mainly hypothesis.

A very striking, recently discovered fact is that certain fluids found in the body of a mother at the moment of giving birth contain substances which have the same ef-

fect in reducing the pain of rheumatoid arthritis as do cortisone and ACTH. Presumably these fluids represent endocrine secretions created in the body of the mother before her child is born, to help carry her through that ordeal.

These body fluids constitute the only substance that has been definitely proved to have effects comparable to those of cortisone and ACTH. A great deal of work has been done on other hormones very similar to these, and some of them have been partially successful. None, however, can really be said to do the work of the original two.

While cortisone and ACTH in most cases only suspend symptoms, this action can be of great importance. An example of this is rheumatic heart disease, where cortisone is more effective than any other therapy. Another example is severe burns and still another, prolonged exposure to great cold. In all these cases, suspending the symptoms permits nature to undertake its own healing processes in ways that would not have been possible without the action of the hormone.

Research in these hormones has produced several important pieces of information in the recent past. For example, at the National Maternity Hospital in Dublin, Ireland, cortisone was found to be useful in the rather common, sometimes serious, toxemias of pregnancy. In a limited number of cases, expectant mothers with high blood pressure, disturbed kidneys and other disorders were given cortisone with apparent marked improvement. Of eight women, seven gave birth to live babies, though without cortisone several more of them, under the normal prognosis, would have experienced stillbirths.

Another item which may prove significant has to do with cancer. Some forms of cancer can be induced in rats by giving them a substance called "butter yellow" (which has nothing to do with the butter in your pantry). When these rats are fed, in advance, a close relative of cortisone called desoxycorticosterone, the butter yellow seems to lose much of its cancer-creating qualities.

Dr. George Sayers of the University of Utah has played an important role in the development of ACTH. He has recently worked out a process which greatly increases the amount of ACTH that can be extracted from a given quantity of hog pituitaries. Dr. Sayers has also done important work on the relationship among the hormones and the speeding up of the processes of the brain which may be called, with approximate truth, excitability. Oddly enough, cortisone and ACTH tend to reduce excitability; but there is another adrenal hormone, DOCA, that increases it. It may therefore be said, without too much poetic license, that your personality is a combination of the effect upon you of DOCA

on one side, and cortisone and ACTH on the other.

One of the important pieces of information that is still lacking is the knowledge of just how the pituitary is told that increased production of ACTH is necessary. Apparently the gland secretes the hormone in varying quantities almost constantly, in accordance with the stress situation by which the organism is confronted at any given moment. We don't yet know what is the signal to the pituitary telling it that more ACTH is needed; or how production is speeded up, which may be a matter of only a few seconds. Neither do we know how the pituitary is notified to shut off the supply. Indeed, there are some students of the subject who dispute the idea that the chief function of ACTH is to speed up the production of cortisone, or that cortisone is the dominant

adrenal secretion. An enormous amount of work, obviously, still needs to be done.

As you have doubtless been told, cortisone and ACTH produce in many people serious side reactions. These may range from growth of hair on the face to much more serious matters, high blood pressure, fluid retention and mental confusion. (These side reactions are reported to be absent in the case of the birth fluids mentioned above.) Doctors are therefore becoming increasingly disinclined to use the hormones in their practice unless there is a really urgent reason to do so. Perhaps we shall some day find a way to overcome these side effects. More probably, as science advances and we are able to suppress the symptoms of disease in other ways, the hormones may be entirely discarded.

MILLIONAIRES' TAX AMENDMENT

CONGRESS and the people may wake up some morning to find that a handful of greedy lobbyists have put over an amendment to the Constitution of the United States that would impoverish the government and enrich the wealthy. Despite the fact that this country is now engaged in one of the greatest preparedness programs in her history, with an estimated \$65 billion earmarked for military needs during the next year, a resolution that would ultimately prohibit the government from taxing more than 25 percent of any individual's income has been quietly slipped through 15 state legislatures. If 17 more approve the resolution, Congress will be forced to call a convention to prepare the millionaires' amendment for final action by the states.

Rep. Wright Patman (D, Tex.) has fought almost single-handedly this scheme to destroy the graduated income tax, the most equitable tax ever devised, since the campaign began in 1938. It originated with the American Taxpayers Association, Inc.—an offspring of the Committee for Constitutional Government which has long been the biggest spender and bitterest opponent of Administration measures to lobby on Capitol Hill—and is the current crusade of the Small Business Economic Foundation, a big-business "front" organization. In 1944, when 17 state legislatures had already passed the resolution, Patman warned Congress that this constitutional amendment was being peddled from state to state by Dr. Edward A. Rumely, Samuel Pettengill and Frank Gannett. "Let no man think that efforts of this Fascist-minded group are to be taken lightly," Patman said at that time. "Let us not underestimate the persistence of this un-American organization (the Committee for

by Jean Begeman

Constitutional Government), with its wealthy backers and others whose pocketbooks have been appealed to because of the lure of more wealth for the wealthy even if such means less for the white-collar worker and the laboring man."

Until the Rumely-Pettengill-Gannett group took their resolution to the state legislatures, all 21 Amendments to the Constitution had been initiated by Congress, after full and open debate. Article V of the Constitution provides:

The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose Amendments to this Constitution, or, on the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several states, shall call a convention for proposing Amendments, which, in either case, shall be valid . . . as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the states, or by conventions in three-fourths of the states.

Because the advocates of the proposed 22nd Amendment realized that Congress would never repeal the income-tax amendment, they appealed to the state legislatures. In almost every case, the amendment was introduced near the end of the legislative session when, with crowded agendas, there was no time for debate. Many of the resolutions passed without the state lawmakers—or their constituents—being aware of the action.

While all of the resolutions are not phrased in identical language, most of them clamp a 25-percent maximum rate on income, gift and inheritance taxes. Patman estimates that even in the most prosperous years a federal deficit in excess of \$10 billion would be created. The only alternative would be greatly increased excise taxes, followed inevitably by a national sales tax. "In other

words," Patman recently told his House colleagues, "the burden of taxation would be transferred from the purses of the rich to the threadbare jeans of the poor."

Although the proposed amendment states that the 25-percent restriction would not apply in time of war, if it were in effect today the defense program would be stymied unless Congress declared a state of war. In 1944, the Division of Tax Research of the Treasury Department prepared an analysis of the effect of such an amendment on the economy. The 50 million persons with incomes of \$5,000 or less, whose taxes are approximately 25 percent under the present tax law, would receive no benefits whatsoever. The greatest benefit would accrue to the 38,000 persons whose annual net incomes, in 1944, were in excess of \$50,000 a year, who would pay an average tax under the proposed amendment of approximately one-third of their present individual tax bills. These 38,000 paid close to \$3 billion in income taxes that year. If the 25-percent limitation had been in effect, they would have paid only \$921 million, which would have saved each of them an average of \$50,000. The 50 million low-income taxpayers who now pay 54.15 percent of the individual income levy would have to assume liability for 65.8 percent of that levy under the "millionaires' amendment."

"To exempt the wealthy few from adequate taxation,"

RESOLUTIONS PETITIONING CONGRESS TO CALL A CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION¹

State	Action by State Legislature
Alabama	Endorsed—1943; Rescinded—1945
Arkansas	Endorsed—1943; Rescinded—1945
Delaware	Endorsed—1943
Florida	Endorsed—1951
Illinois	Endorsed—1943; Rescinded—1945
Indiana	Endorsed—1943
Iowa	Endorsed—1941; Rescinded—1945
Kansas	Endorsed—1951
Kentucky	Endorsed—1944; Rescinded—1946
Louisiana	Not endorsed
Maine	Endorsed—1941
Massachusetts	Endorsed—1941
Michigan	Endorsed—1941
Mississippi	Endorsed—1940
Montana	Endorsed—1951 ²
Nevada	Endorsed—1951
New Hampshire	Endorsed—1943
New Jersey	Endorsed—1944
Pennsylvania	Endorsed—1943 ²
Rhode Island	Endorsed—1940; Rescinded—1949
Utah	Endorsed—1951
Wisconsin	Endorsed—1943; Rescinded—1945
Wyoming	Endorsed—1939

¹ Compiled by the Congressional Library Reference Service.

² Vetoed by the Governor.

Patman charges, "would make it impossible for the government to pay benefits for veterans, their dependents, farmers, the aged and other recipients of social-security assistance." But Vivian Kellems, the lady tycoon whose anti-tax-deduction campaign has given the Treasury Department more headaches than the gamblers exposed by Kefauver, finds the new amendment, and its drastic curtailment of government revenue, to her liking. In one of her many speeches on the subject, she said, "I would repeal the 16th [income-tax] Amendment. Like grandpaw, in 'You Can't Take It With You', I do not believe in it."

The legislatures of 22 states have adopted the resolution. Seven of them later revoked their action, leaving 15 on record as calling for a convention. According to the Reference Service of the Library of Congress, which recently made a study of these resolutions, the period of time during which such a resolution remains effective has not been determined. There is nothing in Article V which specifies that the matter of calling a constitutional convention should be open for all time. In *Dillon v. Glass* (1921), the Supreme Court held that with respect to constitutional amendments, the proposal, resolution and ratification should be treated as related steps in a single endeavor. The "rescinding" resolutions of the three states could be considered a fair indication of a change in public demand and are likely to be recognized by Congress as such. Professor Orfield, in *The Amending of the Federal Constitution* (1942), furthermore, points out that "it must not be assumed that Congress is a mere ministerial cog in the call of a convention. The convention is not the result of the acts of the state legislatures, for it is necessary that Congress act upon their applications. If Congress . . . should refuse to act, there is no valid method of coercing it to make the call."

However, if Congress should be forced to call a convention, the fight to defeat such a proposal would be monumental, since a majority of the delegates present would be representing the 32 states that have passed the resolution. If the Committee for Constitutional Government, the American Taxpayers' League and other such organizations are to be stopped, now is the time for the movement to be checked in the state legislatures. Last month Utah adopted the resolution. The next state may be Connecticut or Idaho. The crusading St. Louis *Post-Dispatch* recently editorialized: "It is time to turn a good, strong searchlight on the lobby which is trying to slip this tax amendment into the Constitution. The quiet operators who have been at work on this plot should be brought out into the open and revealed for what they are."

HAROLD L. ICKES: *"The Gobble-uns'll Git You!"*

THE LACK of morals that now prevails in too much of our public life is illustrated by the shell-game tidelands bill offered by F. E. Walter of Pennsylvania and elbowed through the House of Representatives with the help of Speaker Sam Rayburn. Shameless lobbyists generously supplied slick arguments to use as hand grenades in support of a bill which, if amended as proposed by Sen. Lister Hill of Alabama and Rep. Mike Mansfield of Montana, would shore up our tottering schools in every state. The Association of State Attorneys General egged on the grabbers who want to get into the hands of more pliable state officials the oil-rich offshore lands that the US Supreme Court has decided belong to all of the American people.

The source of the money that is being so open-handedly squandered by the State Attorneys General is easy to guess. It comes, although shyly, from the oil interests that would benefit from this Ali Baba legislation. They have hogsheads of money which they are willing to use to buy themselves outrageous profits with which to do more lobbying against the welfare of the people.

The people themselves are being mulcted of this illicitly spent money because the oil interests deduct most of it from their income taxes as "business expense." Those trained seals, the State Attorneys General, are both impudent and untruthful when they say that, under the doctrine laid down in the California and other tidelands cases, the Federal Government could reach out and seize all of the inland waterways lying within state boundaries. This is a grotesque prevarication. Those resorting to it either are not capable of understanding the law or are willing to distort and misrepresent it for purposes that will not stand the light of day. Another pure invention is that these Supreme Court decisions have opened the way for foreign nations to gain access to our territorial waters.

Even if it were true that it is possible for the Federal Government to take the inland waterways, which I repeat is not the fact, how explain the circumstance that those Cassandras who suffer such anguish over the pretended, but impossible, rape of the inland waterways have not supported any of the bills introduced in Congress to assure that title to the "threatened" waterways is in the states? This false issue could have been settled in favor of the states two or three Congresses ago if the members of Congress subservient to the oil interests, including Representative Walter of Pennsylvania, had supported any of the bills referred to.

Again I charge that the oil interests and their auto-genetically befuddled and willing "me too" Senators and Representatives do not want to have this wraith laid—"The gobble-uns'll git you ef you don't watch out!" They are like the beggar who, deliberately mutilating himself in the hope that his open sores will arouse the pity of the passers-by, refuses to have them cured. The State Attorneys General, the oil and power lobbyists and certain members of Congress, in order to curry favor with the oil interests, are willing deliberately to misrepresent the facts. They have created an imaginary bugaboo. This, with strident voices and contorted faces, they invoke as the reason for stealing from the people the greatest inheritance of mineral wealth that has ever been theirs for aid to education, for reducing the huge public debt or for helping to pay the astronomical costs of rearmament.

Aberrant legislators believe in giving our national riches to those who are already rich, ignoring the fact that we taxpayers are literally stripping ourselves to meet reckless appropriations by Congress, while at the same time straining to pay the outrageous living costs for which the failure of Congress to pass legislation necessary to protect the pocketbook of the average citizen is responsible. "Billions in tribute to the oil Croesus, but not one cent for education!"

How happy we would all be and how proud of our Congress if it were as alert to protect and enhance the welfare of the whole people as it is further to enrich the oil interests! The largesse bestowed by Congress upon the people is the duty to pay impoverishing taxes despite soaring costs of living.

Why do not Representative Walter and Senator Connally tell the truth about this tidelands issue? They would be entitled to the respect that they do not now merit if they should say to the people: "We want to grab for the oil interests these offshore oil lands that now belong to you, but we must admit, in all candor, that the California, Louisiana and Texas decisions do not contain any threat to the inland waterways of any state. If they did, we would help to pass the bill that the Administration favors in order to make assurance doubly sure that there can be no encroachment by the Federal Government upon inland waterways."

As was said in an editorial in the *New York Times* of July 31, "The Walter Bill is entitled the 'Submerged Lands Act'. It seems to us that it would be more appropriate, so far as the American people are concerned, to call it the 'Submerged Rights Act'." HAROLD L. ICKES

BOOKS IN REVIEW

FITZGERALD'S "TENDER"—THE STORY OF A NOVEL

TO THE END of his life Scott Fitzgerald was puzzled by the comparative failure of *Tender Is the Night*, after the years he spent on it and his efforts to make it the best American novel of his time. He had started it when he was living on the Riviera in the late summer of 1925. At first he had worked in bursts and had put aside the manuscript for months at a time while he wrote his profitable stories for the *Saturday Evening Post*; but early in 1932 he had found a more ambitious plan for it and had gone into debt to work on it steadily until the last chapters were written and the last deletions made in proof. He had watched it grow from a short dramatic novel like *The Great Gatsby* to a long psychological or philosophical novel on the model of *Vanity Fair*, and then, as he omitted scene after scene, he had watched it diminish again to a medium-length novel, but one in which he was sure that the overtones of the longer book remained.

Nine years of his life had gone into the writing and into the story itself. Reading closely one could find in it the bedazzlement of his first summer at the Cap d'Antibes—for he could picture himself as Rosemary Hoyt in the story, besides playing the part of Dick Diver; then his feelings about money and about the different levels of American society; then his struggle with alcoholism and his worries about becoming an emotional bankrupt; then his wife's illness and everything he learned from the Swiss and American doctors who diagnosed her case; then the bitter wisdom he gained from experience and couldn't put back into it, but only into his stories; then darker things as well, his sense of guilt, his fear of disaster that became a longing for disaster—it was all in the book, in layers, like the nine buried cities of Troy.

When another writer went to see him at Rodgers Forge, near Baltimore, in

by Malcolm Cowley

the spring of 1933, Fitzgerald took the visitor to his study and showed him a pile of manuscript nearly a foot high. "There's my new novel," he said. "I've written four hundred thousand words and thrown away three-fourths of it. Now I only have fifteen thousand left to write and—" He stood there with a glass in his hand, then suddenly burst out, "It's good, good, good. When it's published people will say that it's good, good, good."

Tender was published in the spring of 1934 and people said nothing of the sort. It dealt with fashionable life in the 1920's at a time when many readers wanted to forget that they had ever been concerned with frivolities; the new fashion was for novels about destitution and revolt. The book had some friendly and even admiring notices—like the one in the *New Republic*—but most reviewers implied that it belonged to the bad old days before the crash; they dismissed it as having a "clever and brilliant surface" without being "wise and mature."

Nor was it a popular success as compared with Fitzgerald's first three novels, which had been easier to write: in the first season it sold 12,000 copies; *This Side of Paradise* had sold 50,000 in a similar period. Presently the new book seemed to be forgotten, although it really wasn't; it stayed in people's minds like a regret or an unanswered question. "A strange thing is that in retrospect his *Tender Is the Night* gets better and better," Ernest Hemingway told Maxwell Perkins, of Scribner's, who was the editor of both novelists. In scores of midnight arguments that I remember, other writers discovered that they had the same feeling about the book.

Fitzgerald continued to brood about it, although he didn't blame the public or the critics. It was one of the conditions of the game he played with life

to accept the rules as they were written; if he lost point and set after playing his hardest, that was due to some mistake in strategy to be corrected in the future. He began looking for the mistake in *Tender Is the Night*.

In December, 1948, when he was in Hollywood and was drawing near the end of his contract with Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer, he wrote to Perkins suggesting that three of his novels might be reprinted in one volume. *This Side of Paradise* would appear with a glossary that Fitzgerald planned to make of its absurdities and inaccuracies. *Gatsby* would be unchanged except for a few corrections in the text (they were penciled into Fitzgerald's copy of the novel and some of them have still to be transcribed). "But I am especially concerned about *Tender*," he added, "—that book is not dead. The *depth* of its appeal exists—I meet people constantly who have the same exclusive attachment to it as others had to *Gatsby* and *Paradise*, people who identified themselves with Dick Diver. Its great fault is that the *true* beginning—the young psychiatrist in Switzerland—is tucked away in the middle of the book."

The first edition of the novel had opened with the visit to the Cap d'Antibes of a young moving-picture actress, Rosemary Hoyt, and her meeting with the circle that surrounded the Richard Divers. It was the summer of 1925 and Antibes was enjoying its days of quiet glory. Rosemary had been entranced with the Divers and their friends, had fallen in love with Dick in a pleasantly youthful and hopeless fashion and had become aware that there was some mystery about his wife. Then, on pages 151-212, the story had gone back to wartime Switzerland in order to explain the mystery by telling about young Dr. Diver's courtship and marriage. "If pages 151-212 were taken from their present place and put at the

start," Fitzgerald said in his letter to Perkins, "the improvement in appeal would be enormous."

In the literary notebook that he was keeping Fitzgerald made a new outline for *Tender* in which he followed the changed order and divided the novel into five books instead of three. He also transferred the changes to his personal copy of the novel, which is now in the manuscript room of the Princeton University Library. The pages of that copy are cut from the binding and rearranged in the new order, and there are also many small changes and corrections in the text. On the inside front cover Fitzgerald has written in pencil:

"This is the *final version* of the book as I would like it." *

The question remains whether the final version as Fitzgerald would like it is also the best version of the novel. I was slow to make up my mind about it, perhaps out of affection for the book in its earlier form. The beginning of the first edition, with the Divers seen and admired through the innocent eyes of Rosemary Hoyt, is effective by any standards. Some of the effectiveness is lost in the new arrangement, where the reader already knows the truth about the Divers before Rosemary meets them. There is a mystery-story element in the earlier draft: something has passed between Nicole Diver and Mrs. McKisco that is shocking enough to cause a duel, and we read on to learn what Nicole has done or said. There is also the suggestion of a psychoanalytical case study: it is as if we were listening outside the analyst's door while his two patients, Nicole and Dick, help him to penetrate slowly beneath their glittering surfaces.

But the mystery story ends when Rosemary discovers—on page 148 of the first edition—what Violet McKisco had seen in the bathroom at Villa Diana. The psychoanalytical case study is finished by page 212, when the reader has all the pertinent information about the past life of the Divers; but mean-

while half of the novel is still to come. The critics were right when they said that *Tender* broke in two after Rosemary left the scene. By rearranging the story in chronological order Fitzgerald tied it together. He sacrificed a brilliant beginning and all the element of mystery, but he ended with a better constructed and more effective novel.

One fault of the earlier version was its uncertainty of focus. We weren't quite sure in reading it whether the author had intended to write about a whole group of Americans on the Riviera—that is, to make the book a social study with a collective hero—or whether he had intended to write a psychological novel about the glory and decline of Richard Diver as a person. We are certain in reading the final version that the novel is psychological, that it is about Dick Diver and that its social meanings are obtained by extension or synecdoche: Dick is the part that stands for the whole.

It has to be said that Fitzgerald could never have revised *Tender* into the perfect novel that existed as an ideal in his mind. He had worked too long over it and his plans for it had changed too often, just as the author himself had changed during the years since his first summer on the Riviera. To make it all of a piece he would have had to start over from the beginning and invent a wholly new series of episodes, instead of trying to salvage as much as possible from the earlier versions. No matter how often he threw his material back into the melting pot, some of it would prove refractory to heat and would keep its former shape when poured into the new mold. The whole Rosemary episode, being rewritten from sections of the manuscript that go back to 1925, would be a little out of key with the much-later-written story of Dick Diver as witnessed by himself and by his wife. But a novel has to be judged for what it gives us, not for its defects in execution, and *Tender* gives us an honesty of feeling, a complexity of life, that we miss in many books admired for being nearly perfect in form.

Moreover, in Fitzgerald's final revision it has a symmetry that we do not

often find in long psychological novels. All the themes introduced in the first book are resolved in the last, and both books are written in the same key. In the first book young Dr. Diver is said to be like Grant in his general store at Galena, waiting "to be called to an intricate destiny"; meanwhile he helps another psychiatrist with the case of Nicole Warren, an heiress suffering from schizophrenia, and learns that the Warrens have planned to buy a young doctor for her to marry. In the last book he finishes her cure, realizes that the Warrens have indeed purchased and used him—"That's what he was: educated for," Nicole's sister says—and is left biding his time, "again like Grant in Galena," but with the difference that his one great adventure has ended.

When I read *Tender* in 1934 it seemed to me as to many others that the Rosemary section was the best part of it. The writing there was of a type too seldom encountered in serious American fiction. It was not an attempt to analyze social values, show their falseness, tear them down—that is a necessary attempt at all times when values have become perverted, but it requires no special imaginative vitality and Fitzgerald was doing something more difficult; he was trying to discover and even create values in a society where they had seemed to be lacking.

Rosemary with her special type of innocence offered the right point of view from which to reveal the grace and manners and apparent moral superiority of the Diver clan. The high point of her experience—and of the reader's—was the dinner at Villa Diana, when "The table seemed to have risen a little toward the sky like a mechanical dancing platform, giving the people around it a sense of being alone with each other in the dark universe, nourished by its only food, warmed by its only lights." Then came the underside of the Divers' little world, as revealed in Abe North's self-destructiveness and in what Violet McKisco had seen, and everything that followed seemed a long anticlimax or at best the end of a different story.

Coming back to the novel long after

* A new edition of *Tender Is the Night*, based on the Princeton copy, will be published by Scribner's next fall. The present article forms part of the introduction to that volume. — M. C.

ward and reading it in the new arrangement I had a different impression. The *Rosemary* section had its old charm and even with something added, for it was now the evocation of an age first condemned, then forgotten and finally recalled with pleasure in the midst of harsher events; but the writing seemed to be on a lower level of intensity than the story of the hero's decay as told in the last section of the novel. That becomes the truly memorable passage: not Dick as the "organizer of private gaiety, curator of a richly incrustated happiness"; not Dick creating his group of friends and making them seem incredibly distinguished—"so bright a unit that Rosemary felt an impatient disregard for all who were not at their table"; but another Dick who has lost command of himself and deteriorates before our eyes in a strict progression from scene to scene.

At this point Fitzgerald was right when he stopped telling the story from Dick's point of view and allowed us merely to guess at the hero's thoughts. Dick fades like a friend who is withdrawing into a private world or sinking to another level of society and, in spite of knowing so much about him, we are never quite certain of the reasons for his decline. Perhaps, as Fitzgerald first planned, it was the standards of the leisure class that corrupted him; perhaps it was the strain of curing a psychotic wife, who gains strength as he loses it by a mysterious transfer of vitality; perhaps it was a form of emotional exhaustion, a giving of himself so generously that he went beyond his resources, "like a man overdrawing at the bank," as Fitzgerald would later say of his own crack-up; or perhaps it was something far back in his childhood that could only be discovered by deep analysis. We can argue about the causes as we can argue about the decline of a once-intimate friend, without coming to a fixed conclusion; but the point is that we always believe in Dick and in his progress in a circle from obscurity to obscurity. With our last glimpse of him stumbling to a high terrace and making a papal cross over the beach that he had found and peopled and that has now rejected him, his fate is accomplished and the circle closed.

THE DEEP WATERS

THE SEA AROUND US, by Rachel L. Carson (Oxford University Press; \$3.50).

AMONG popular writings on the sea, this delightful book is unusual in that it stresses the physical, geographical and esthetic aspects of its subject, rather than the biological ones. The reader is even kept aware of the present geographical and dynamic continuity of the oceans, a continuity on which so much of the sea's behavior and properties depend and which is responsible for so much of the world's climate. At the same time, the sea's continuity from the remote past is kept fully in view, with the important part it has played in the history of the earth. Difficult subjects like tides, and the nature, investigation and interpretation of the sea's floor, are dealt with well and lucidly, though one would have welcomed a fuller discussion of the difference in chemical make-up between seawater on the one hand and the world's rivers on the other. The book is most commendably up-to-date, as, for instance, in the description of the use of sonic methods in navigation and in the investigation of such phenomena as the "deep scattering layer" of the oceans. One or two passages are a little weak, notably the misleading account of the phosphate cycle on page 29. Diatoms are fewest in winter not because of lack of fertilizing salts (which are in fact at their maximum at that season), but because there is insufficient light for photosynthesis.

An extremely pleasant feature of the book is the author's appreciation of the writing of others; she makes use of many quotations, especially from the Pilot Books of the US Hydrographic Office and British Admiralty. It is good to find someone valuing properly the literary merits of these publications; if English-speaking children were taught prose composition from the Admiralty Pilot Books, both Business English and Civil Service English might well become extinct, to the great benefit of mankind. The book is not as attractive to look at as it is to read; there are hardly any illustrations, the representation on the cover is quite without meaning and

the typography of the list of contents is so freakish as to make this page not only ugly but the most difficult to read in the whole volume. These physical blemishes are far outweighed, however, by an admirable list of reading materials and an excellent index.

JOHN S. COLMAN

John S. Colman is director of the Marine Biological Station at Port Erin, Isle of Man, and author of *The Sea and Its Mysteries*, published last year by Norton.

MEMO ON MANN

THOMAS MANN, by Henry Hatfield (New Directions; \$2).

HENRY HATFIELD'S *Thomas Mann* is one of the better volumes in the series, "The Makers of Modern Literature." I came to the book with considerable prejudice. Mann is not one of my favorite writers and the "Makers" series has not lived up to the exciting prospectus issued when it was started years ago.

Mann is no Baudelaire or Dostoevsky, but notoriously an annalist and judge of middle-class society who speaks from within its own ranks. He suffers from the conspicuous middle-class vices. He is muddle-headed, warm-hearted, tender-minded, popular to the point of vulgarity, pessimistic to the point of self-abasement, optimistic to the point of messianic pomposity, with a mind easily influenced by the editorials of the press—the liberal press, of course. It would be easy to write a devastating but interesting little book about him, and there exist plenty of people who could write dull, laudatory ones.

Hatfield's book is judicious, thorough, and not too taken in. As such, it is more than suitable for the audience for which, with few exceptions, the "Makers" series seems to be published—at once a supplementary textbook for undergraduates, a guide for graduate students and civilized light reading.

In addition, there are all sorts of little rewarding felicities—the sources of various leitmotifs in Mann's more elaborate works—details like the mention of the influence of *Renée Mauperin* on the death scene of little Buddenbrooks—which are a pleasure to come on, and show balanced, critical craftsmanship. Finally, there emerges like an emanation

from the book an image of the civilized, sentimental, middle-class Germany which will never be again, the Teutondom for which Franz Joseph rather than Wilhelm was a somewhat ridiculous, but none the less pathetic, symbol.

KENNETH REXROTH

Kenneth Rexroth is a poet, playwright, painter and editor. His translation of Benjamin Constant's *Adolphe* will be published this winter.

FICTION PARADE

THE MIRACULOUS BARBER, by Marcel Aymé (Harper; \$3).

EACH MAN'S SON, by Hugh MacLennan (Little, Brown; \$3).

A QUESTION OF UPBRINGING, by Anthony Powell (Scribner's; \$2.75).

THESE THREE skillful and highly readable books, by a Frenchman, a Canadian and an Englishman, exemplify admirably the novel of situation, of character and of reminiscence.

Marcel Aymé has written seventeen novels, but it is only recently that his satire has become popular with English readers. *The Miraculous Barber* explores the unlikely and yet apropos antics of a crazily mixed lot of Frenchmen during the Popular Front days. Hovering in the background, behind boxer-poets, unhappy factory owners, cuckolds, long-distance runners, eminent Catholic novelists and middle-class bohemians, is a seedy barber who is the secret ruler of France. The intricate intertwining of seemingly unconnected lives is very much in the manner of *The Counterfeiters*, with almost continuous comic shock resulting from the incongruous juxtapositions. But whereas there is in Gide a serene intelligence manipulating the parts so that the whole seems inevitable and perfectly just, this novel strikes me as somewhat contrived and tuned to a nihilism that is less than Olympian. Nevertheless it is good unclean fun, more fun than any other novel of the year.

While Hugh MacLennan's novel is suffused with feeling for the isolated Nova Scotian island of Cape Breton, it is basically a study in the character structure of a brilliant surgeon, childless because of an operation he himself has had to perform on his wife and tortured by his longing for a son and his Calvinist conscience, which tells him that he is turning away from his innocent wife. Dr. Ainslie's frenzied absorption with his medical work brings him into contact with a charming little boy to whom he is strongly attracted; the boy's father has deserted the mines of the island to become a prize-fighter, and his lonely mother has become

involved with an importunate Frenchman. The return of the beaten prize-fighter coincides with the seduction of the boy's mother, and the bloody resolution of the triangle, which enables Dr. Ainslie to claim the boy, is much too pat to satisfy the stern demands of the doctor's proud spirit or to render deeply moving his inner trials. Despite MacLennan's sensitive prose and his earnest attention to the problem of the conscience-ridden hero, we learn little that we could not have surmised from his preface, for there is no element of surprise or sudden insight into the doctor's human condition, and we are left with the feeling that the author has doggedly traced—although with taste and craftsmanship—a preconceived portrait of a dedicated man that is never really illuminating, for all its warmth and sympathetic rendering.

Anthony Powell relies in his novel not on plot or character, but on a number of deceptively simple reminiscences which reveal the growth and decline of the friendships of three English public-school boys as they come of age. There is no ostensible connection between the indi-

vidual episodes other than the presence of the narrator, but we are gradually made aware of the crevices which will widen into chasms separating the boyhood friends until all that remains is the adult's wavering memory of comradeships that failed to survive the haphazard pressure of isolated events. Powell has the eye of an artist, and his acidly brilliant portraits of the families and teachers of Jenkins and his schoolmates are as pleasurable as a visit to a well-ordered gallery; but his characters, although they speak English, are far more foreign to us than Aymé's hilarious Frenchmen or MacLennan's brooding Gaelic islanders. It is not easy for Americans to grasp the apparent coolness of the relationships between English boys of a certain class, or their casual attachment to their families. One wonders whether it is a question of upbringing, as Powell implies, or whether it is really a question of understatement, which in this beautifully etched but ice-cool novel has been carried to a point where the slender theme has been practically vacated of the emotional content which we expect from serious novels of whatever type.

HARVEY SWADOS

THEATRE: In Contrast to Fry*

THE ENGLISH, without having any drama, have at the moment a better theatre than the French. I cannot say why the English have produced no group to take the place of Galsworthy, Maugham, Barrie, Pinero, Shaw or even a new Lonsdale, Noel Coward group (Terence Rattigan is not enough), but it is a fact that they haven't. Sean O'Casey is rarely produced, and the plays dealing with contemporary problems are so few that a piece like *His Excellency*, by Dorothy and Campbell Christie, about a Labour man facing colonial issues in an island that might be Malta, becomes an outstanding exception.

This explains, in part, why *The Cocktail Party* and the plays of Christopher Fry occupy their extraordinary position. It is interesting to compare Fry with the French playwrights I have been discussing. The French tone is nervous, debilitated, rather anguished even when it is presumably light. (Sartre, however,

has a certain dry energy, and mental vigor.)

There is in Fry something of an affable acquiescence to the prevailing pessimism of the Continental world view. He seems to take for granted that every intelligent person agrees that life is terrible and that to be a blithe optimist nowadays is to set oneself down as an idiot. The characteristic Fry hero either proclaims himself almost eager to die or accepts his own identity only because his neighbors affirm that he has one. The most positive act performed by a Fry hero is to resign from a formerly extensive activity and give his blessings to a son who may possibly find some pleasure in a world become too raw for older men.

But where the French seem sick, bitter or hysterically exalted about the general breakdown, Fry is humorous, gentle, almost sweetly ironic. He is fundamentally undisturbed. His heroes' rejection of life—and their subsequent acceptance or resignation—often seems

*This article is the second of several reflective essays on the theatre that Mr. Clurman will contribute in the next few weeks.

This new book about Red China will not please MacArthur or Truman or Mao...

But this report by two American correspondents who lived and worked inside Red China tells the whole truth about Red China as it really exists, the good and the bad—censoring nothing, weighting nothing, omitting nothing.

"Not just another partisan fantasy or synthetic China 'story', but the China truth, as nearly as two clear-eyed, clear-headed and honest observers could report it, with no quarter to either left or right."—EDGAR SNOW.

"A balanced, fair judgment of Communist China, the latest and solidest report on that country."—NATHANIEL PEPPER, Professor of International Relations, Columbia University.

PROFILE OF RED CHINA

By Lynn and Amos Landman
\$3.00. SIMON AND SCHUSTER

little more than a series of pretty gestures. And Fry's inherent tenderness is related to an ability to keep himself outside the situations he presents. When he writes what might be called a pacifist play—*A Sleep of Prisoners*—there is a mildness of manner in it that makes the author seem, not above the battle, but one for whom the battle exists. There are two types of men—the play tells us—the doers, who are always getting themselves and us in trouble, and those who only want to *be* (artists, students, simple workers), who bid us cultivate life in all its contradictions with equal love. Perhaps some day the second will influence the first, perhaps somehow, despite the eternal quality and struggle that ensue from it, man will finally come through.

This constitutes a state of being rather than a point of view, so that Fry's plays, even when they deal with hanging, shooting, air raids and other violence, seem almost without action and are always on the verge of becoming literary exercises, comedic incanta-

tions, lyric charades, rather than the projection of real conflicts.

But while Fry is at the beginning of his career, which he will undoubtedly center in the theatre, a good many of the French playwrights use the theatre only incidentally. Fry's attitude is that of a man who has managed to find himself a small nook from which he may develop in quiet and safety during a period of transition; the Frenchmen use the stage to achieve a clarity that is still only in the making and which many of them feel may not be of their making.

Fry's use of the dramatic form is rather personal in its offhandedness; the French are more traditionally classic. But both use the medium to embody general ideas. In this they are different from the American playwrights, whose main impulse comes from direct contact with life in terms of character and environment. I am inclined to believe the American dramatists—from O'Neill to Odets, Hellman, Williams and Miller—are working in a richer vein than any other in the contemporary theatre. The present French writing for the theatre, though often related to major problems, seems constantly to carry the spectator away from life to a rather airless realm of speculation—above the crowd and above life itself. Fry occupies a charming niche which the world can regard with pleasure, but which is generally atypical.

American dramatists try to come to grips with the rough material of everyday experience, but only through this often crude, long, apparently wasteful experimental contact with life can the soundest expression be achieved. The fact that the American playwright sticks closer to the form of an old-fashioned realism must not deceive us into believing the Europeans are more admirable. The artistic and cultural timetables of the various countries are different: the more stylized forms employed by the European are as often a sign of a certain attrition of material and emotion as they are of wisdom.

The problems of the American playwright are not only the problems of our culture in general but of our theatre in

particular. The danger for the American dramatist is that he will make the defects of our theatre an excuse for abandoning his task. He is certainly not less talented than his French or English like, but he is generally less serious. The American playwright has a predisposition to "spoil" with his theatrical environment—a temptation which it is his artistic and human duty to resist.

HAROLD CLURMAN

ON THE AIR

Away from It All

OVER the car radio, WELLFLEET, MASS. all the way up from New York to Cape Cod, I kept in touch with the world. Once for two minutes or so, every station I turned to carried the same program—the important bulletin from Tokyo announcing that General Ridgway had suspended the Korean peace talks because armed Red troops had been seen in the Kaesong conference area. Every half hour, from one transmitter or another, I could pick up newscasts, dully written, routinely spoken. For the rest, the world coming over the radio waves consisted of singers, with a few bands tossed in for good measure. The disc jockeys were at work. Rosemary Clooney invited me to *Come On-a My House*, offering "everything." Bing Crosby joined Jane Wyman in *In the Cool, Cool, Cool of the Evening*. Miss Clooney's invitation was repeated by Kay Starr, while Georgia Gibbs and Margaret Whiting competed in putting over *Good Morning, Mr. Echo*. To be fair, some of the stations muzzled their disc jockeys for part of the afternoon—and carried baseball instead. That shows the broadcasters are not entirely deaf to the pleas for public service programs.

As for television, there are ample possibilities for reception on Cape Cod, despite what my fellow observer Fred Rayfield, Radio-TV editor of the daily New York *Compass*, reported from this Massachusetts sandspit just before I left home. With glee unbecoming one who makes his living by looking at tele-

vision through socially-conscious spectacles, Rayfield implied that this area is still untouched by video. I'm afraid he had been playing hooky on the beach. The antennas are not as thick around here as they are in New York's (or Boston's) suburbs, but there are enough sets in public eating and drinking places, country stores, and here and there in church rectories, to indoctrinate the young in the doings of *Howdy Doodie* and to keep Hopalong's fame high on the small-fry hit parade. Some homes also have TV. My closest neighbor, in fact, had a set installed the day I arrived. He comes from Fairbanks, Alaska, and had just arrived here, bringing with him his two pre-adolescent sons for their first visit to the States. The set is to orient them in American ways. Through the window I could see them sprawled on the floor, their faces eagerly turned toward the big 19-inch screen their father had put in. I didn't have to look in order to know what they saw most frequently. I could hear it. It was Lucky Strike's "Be Happy, Go Lucky" commercial.

I wish I knew what effect the Ford Foundation's latest grant for educational television might hold for us. Out of that heavy money bag, I'm informed, \$1,200,000 has been earmarked for the production of educational programs on films to be broadcast by commercial TV stations. Edward L. Bernays, chairman of one of the principal committees fighting for special allocation of airwave channels for non-commercial, educational television, is unhappy over this distribution of Ford largesse. So is the National Association of Educational Broadcasters. The embattled groups fear that the Ford money, by enabling the established outlets to make an occasional and painless gesture toward educational material, will only help furnish ammunition in the commercial men's fight against giving a large percentage of the TV channels over to non-profit operations. I'm afraid that Bernays and the NAEB are right.

I also wish I knew what the American Civil Liberties Union means by a letter its executive director, Patrick

Murphy Malin, has written to Walter White of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. Malin addressed himself to the subject mentioned here a few weeks ago: the NAACP call for a boycott against Schenley Industries because Blatz Beer—a Schenley drink—sponsors *Amos 'n' Andy* over CBS-TV. Malin asserts that:

(1) ACLU joins NAACP in "expressing disapproval of the program" and in "urging that everyone refrain from tuning to it"; furthermore (2) ACLU will defend NAACP's organization of a boycott of "the particular product advertised on the program"; (3) "but, because the field of communication differs significantly from the general field of industry and commerce, we urge NAACP not to resort to even that measure of coercion"; (4) and, we shall actively oppose any attempt by NAACP to organize a boycott of any other products or services of the sponsors or promoters, or of the radio and television stations and networks." The high moral principle at issue here is anything but clear.

It's easier for me to understand the viewpoint of the numerous readers who have written me about my support of the NAACP boycott. One of them, Daniel Simon, of Chicago, demurs. He objects to treating "minority groups as pampered pets," and relies on the fact that a number of radio and TV programs treating of minorities, including *A 'n' A*, have been praised by "critics and public alike." As for the public—the CBS-TV outlet in Milwaukee, home of Blatz beer, has already announced cancellation of *Amos 'n' Andy*. Reader Simon wants to know whether some of those racial shows he likes should be replaced by old movies, mysteries and wrestlers. I wish I could prove to him that there are many educators as well as hundreds of radio and television writers, producers, directors and actors willing and able to put much more substantial fare on the air—if the broadcasters and the FCC would only give them air space and time. But above all, I wish it weren't raining today; I'd like to be out on the beach.

SAUL CARSON

MERRIEWOODE

A CAMP FOR ADULTS

HIGHLAND LAKE • STODDARD, N. H.

Where Interesting People Meet for the Perfect Vacation. Enjoy beautiful 10-mile lake. All Land and Water Sports. Interesting hiking objectives thru woodland trails. Arts & Crafts, Square and Folk Dancing Instruction. 4 hrs. by train from N.Y.

OLIVE "HATTIE" BARON, Director

Write Dept. R for Literature • Tel.: Hancock 98, Ring 13



Year 'round Adult Activities

Hathaway Lodge

Formerly the palatial 592-acre Macy estate. Luxurious rooms, many with open fireplaces. Swimming pool, clay tennis courts, handball, badminton. Horseback riding, hiking—magnificent mountain trails. Recordings, library, informal dancing. Delicious American-Jewish food. Easy transportation. Attractive Rates. For reservations or booklet "R":

HATHAWAY LODGE

Haines Falls, N. Y.

Phone Tannersville 299



on SCHROON LAKE

POTTERSVILLE, N. Y.

OSCAR BRAND & Complete Staff in a Season-Long Festival of FOLK SONG, ARTS, DANCE, MUSIC & DRAMA. ANITA & JULES ADOLPHE, Folk Dancers. All Sports—Private Beach, Boating, Canoeing. 5 Championship Clay Tennis Courts. Dance Orchestra, Cozy Bar, Excellent Food. Booklet on Request. Camp Phone Chesterstown 2830-9681. City Off.: 142 Montague St., B'klyn 2, N. Y. Phones: Main 4-8670 or Main 4-1230. LEAH OKUN, Director.

HANDWRITING ANALYSIS

SCIENTIFIC HANDWRITING analysis, Alfred Kanfer, 62 Leroy St., N. Y. C. Tel. WA 4-1575. Cooperating with doctors, psychologists, schools, firms, industries. Lessons. By appointment, or mail. Marital, educational, vocational, psychological problems. Fee \$5.00.

LANGUAGES

IT'S Fun Learning a Language by Linguaphone Conversational Method. At home, quickly, easily master Spanish, French, German, Russian, Asiatic—any of 29 languages. Add to Service, job, travel opportunities. Send for FREE book. Approved for VETERANS' Training. Linguaphone Institute, 8608 Rockefeller Plaza, New York 23, N. Y.

LITERARY SERVICES

ATTENTION ALL WRITERS!

Do you have an idea suitable for story or book? We will develop that idea for publication. Complete cooperation. No "stuff shirt" reception, but friendly, sympathetic decision over editor's desk. Phone or write to-day! Mead Agency, 419 Fourth Ave., New York 16. (OR 9-1150).

BOOKS

ATHEIST BOOKS, 32-page catalogue free. Truth Seeker Co., 38 Park Row, N. Y. C. 8.

CLASSIFIED RATES

BARGAIN

Per word (single insertion).....12¢
Per word 6 times in one contract year...11¢
Per word 13 times in one contract year...10¢
Per word 26 times in one contract year... 9¢

ADVERTISING DEPT.

New Republic 40 E. 49 St. N.Y.C.

Message from **KOREA:**

"Please send me newspaper clippings of the war and of important issues: since I've been called back it's been hard to keep up with things."

-- A U. S. Marine

This is the second war he has had to fight, the second time he has sacrificed all the conveniences and luxuries we Americans are so used to. Now he asks a little news—a few clippings on what's going on in the world, including how things are going in Korea. That's right: He wants to know what's happening in Korea.

Strange? Well, not so strange, when you think of it. He can't turn on the radio in the morning or watch TV at night. He can't buy a newspaper on his way to or from his job. His world is limited to foxholes, mud, and bursting bombs, advances and retreats. He wants and deserves to know what is the meaning behind it all, what is going on back here: "What happened to MacArthur? Will Truman run again? Are we going to send more troops overseas? Will the 18-year-olds be drafted? Are we going to bomb Manchuria? Can you still buy a beer for a dime? ..."

These are the things which, important to us, are just as important to him.

Surely you must know a sailor, soldier or marine serving somewhere—in the U.S. or overseas—who would be delighted to receive a copy of the **NEW REPUBLIC** every week. Let this paper be his window to the world. Just fill out the coupon below; if he is overseas, include his APO or FPO number.

Armed Service Order Form

THE NEW REPUBLIC

40 East 49 Street • New York 17, N. Y.

For the enclosed \$4.00 please enter an annual subscription in my name at the special Armed Service rate of \$4.00. (Open to active members of the Services at APO or military addresses.)

NAME _____

ADDRESS _____

IN FULL _____

8-20-51

Regular Order Form

THE NEW REPUBLIC

40 East 49 Street • New York 17, N. Y.

For the enclosed \$6.50 please enter an annual subscription in my name. (Foreign or Canadian postage \$1.00 extra.)

NAME _____

STREET _____

CITY _____

ZONE _____ STATE _____

8-20-51

The Charles C. Sherrill Library
EAST TENNESSEE STATE COLLEGE